

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PROFESSOR RAYMOND DODGE TO THE INSTITUTE OF HUMAN RELATIONS

Professor Dodge was a charter member of the Institute of Human Relations. As a prominent figure in the Institute of Psychology, which was merged into the Institute of Human Relations, he participated in the deliberations that led to the organization of the latter. From the outset he was intrigued by its ideals and objectives. So early as 1919 he had written two articles on Mental Engineering with reference to the work of psychologists during the War. In the second article, "Mental Engineering After the War,"¹ he proposed the organization of a General College of Mental Engineering. "As an organized scientific body, the business of such an institution would be to collect and systematize the available data in all important fields of mental engineering, to integrate the most pressing problems with all the researches of the human sciences, and to indoctrinate qualified students and groups." It would be "an institution for coöperative and intensive practical research in the conditions of human efficiency and morale."

"A College of Mental Engineering should include at least four great schools. These are a Central School of Social Engineering for the discovery and reinforcement of such cohering and stabilizing social forces as are still available; a School of Industrial Engineering for studying the mental problems of our industrial life; a School of Educational Engineering that looks to the future; and a School of Expression to study the problems of 'putting things across.'

"In all these directions there are well-established scientific and academic traditions. But nowhere in the world, as far as I can learn, does there exist any agency for coördinating the available fragments of our science of the social mind for the practical solution of our pressing social problems."

¹ *The American Review of Reviews*, June, 1919, p. 610.

This remarkable forecast of the Institute's objectives, made ten years before its inception, reveals the quality of scientific wisdom and hard common sense that characterizes Professor Dodge's valuable services to the Institute. His scientific acumen and his intense interest in the technical problems of his laboratories never for a moment obscured his vision of the ultimate goal. These qualities rather made him more conscious of the barriers to be overcome before the Institute could reach its objectives.

As soon as the Institute building was completed, Professor Dodge began a series of coöperative studies which continued until his retirement. Among the first was a joint study with Doctor Eugen Kahn which resulted in their monograph on *Craving for Superiority*. This was the first piece of coöperative research published by the Institute. The first volume in the Institute's series of publications, however, was Dodge's *Conditions and Consequences of Human Variability*. His work with Doctor Kahn represented one of the first bridges between psychology and psychiatry. Professor Dodge maintained from the outset a keen interest in the problems of psychiatry. He attended regularly the staff meetings of that department, consulted with individual members of the staff on research problems, and was instrumental in the establishment of the Laboratories of Physiological Psychology as a permanent bridge between psychiatry and psychology.

His coöperative work with members of the medical faculty was by no means confined to psychology. His wide range of scientific interests enabled him to carry on collaborative work with both the clinical and pre-clinical divisions of the School of Medicine. He invented and perfected an instrument for measuring the terminal pulse which drew him into collaborative research with Doctors Harold M. Marvin and Frederick W. Roberts on problems in clinical medicine.² His collaborations with the pre-clinical divisions of the School of Medicine included joint supervision of the research of junior men who were working on problems that involved both psychology and neuro-anatomy or neuro-

² Not yet published.

physiology, and also co-operative planning of research with Doctors Harold S. Burr and J. G. Dusser de Barenne.

Within the Department of Psychology he has always spent much time in consulting with graduate students, research assistants, and his colleagues, on scientific problems. His scientific insight, resourcefulness, and technical ingenuity, plus his willingness to give unstintingly of his time and energy to others, won for him the distinction of being a key man in the Institute.

His collaborative efforts were not wholly confined to the biological fields. During the War, he had become interested in a variety of social problems, to some of which he had given considerable attention. While he did not feel qualified to give technical consultation to students in the social fields, yet he was always willing to discuss with them the basic problems. In 1929, the year of the Institute's birth, he prepared a short memorandum, at the request of the directors, on "Two Fundamental Problems in Human Relations."³ The first is the problem of determining scientifically the conditions under which social groups are formed, and the second is the problem of the conditions under which they remain permanent or fall apart.

"The scientific and practical importance of these problems makes it somewhat surprising that they have received so little scientific attention. Notwithstanding many relevant scientific observations as far as I know they have never been subjected to scientific analysis or adequate psycho-sociological investigation. Even in systematic social psychologies, they have received scant space.

. . . . "I believe that group formation and group permanence could be studied profitably within all the sciences which are included in the Institute. Anthropologically, they could be studied in the reactions of primitive people so far as these effect their grouping; and the disintegration of their groups in contact with other cultures. The suggested problems and hypotheses are related to the whole question of the survival of cultures. They might be studied comparatively in such phenomena as animal mating, the hunting of the pack, the flight of birds, and the

³ Unpublished.

migrations of all migrating creatures. In human history they might be studied in a great variety of reactions to cultural innovations, from fashions to trade unions, from political parties to the development of nations and the League of Nations. In contemporary society they might be studied in an equally great variety of phenomena. From the family to fraternal associations and the learned societies; from street crowds to such stable groups as the Catholic Church.

"In addition it may be suggested that the hypotheses probably reach well back into biological processes such as the grouping of cells into various organs with their differential reactions to various diffused stimuli, such as drugs, hormones, and neural excitation."

In 1933 he struck the keynote once more in his paper on "Mental Nearness."⁴ Here he points out that the basic biological human urges and cravings underlie many, if not all, human-relations problems. He says,

"There are three proximate questions at issue in the effort to understand or to facilitate any human relationship. The first one is, 'What is its nature?' The second is, 'How may it be measured?' And the third is, 'What is its natural history?' or more simply, 'What are its dynamic conditions?'

"Mental nearness may be factored out into separable tendencies making up a kind of polygon of forces. A total effect or resultant of an experience of nearness may coexist with great discrepancies of age, race, religion and manners, though such discrepancies are unfavorable tendencies in the polygon and must be counterbalanced by more or stronger factors. Obviously the same degree of mental nearness may differ in the rank order in its several conditions. If one tries to analyze out of common experience with normal and abnormal persons the several factors which determine his experience of mental nearness the resulting list would be a long one. Only the more important tendencies which influence mutual feelings of nearness belong to this discussion. All seem to involve some sort of community.

⁴ *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, October-December, 1933, pages 233-244.

"... The main conclusion of this informal discussion may be summarized by reëmphasizing the complexity of the conditions of mutual mental nearness. No one factor operates alone independent of the rest. Together they resemble the polygon of forces in physics. Each important condition has its appreciable effect on the resultant, modified by all the others. The mental engineer, operating for social coherence, cannot safely ignore any of the actual lines of force that make for mental nearness. Whether he be politician or statesman, pastor or pacifist, educationist or reformer, he should seek to envisage the various lines of force in the totality of their interaction—their several facilitations, interferences and their integration. It seems to some of us that only in such systematizations can the foundations be laid for a practical social dynamics."

These quotations illustrate the type of fundamental thinking that Professor Dodge contributed to the clarification of the objectives of the Institute. They show how his value to the Institute reached beyond his scientific contributions. He extended a wholesome influence in promoting human relations among the staff. He was always alert to the barriers that might block the Institute's progress toward its goal. To him one of the main functions of the Institute was that it should operate to remove the barriers to coöperative and coördinated research.

Finally I would end this note of appreciation for the leadership and many-sided service of Professor Dodge to the Institute of Human Relations by quoting a paragraph from a recent statement in which he summed up what the Institute has meant to him:

"I think we can all agree that however incompletely the idea of the Institute has been realized, the Institute as at present constituted has been of real service to our scientific work. If we should attempt to outline this service I think that first and foremost would stand the extraordinary good will of our peers. I know of no place where scientific work is being done where such general good will can be so certainly counted on without jealousies or petty conflicts. A close second in the services of the Institute is the opportunity it has given us for the stimulating exchange of ideas in casual meetings and more formal conferences. Many

of us have profited by the opportunities it offers for supplementing our knowledge of related fields, especially in our experimental work. Science is so vast that few of us can keep up adequately with the developments in our own field and none of us can keep up with the developments in related fields that are often essential to the interpretation of our findings. Many of us have profited, some of us extraordinarily, by the criticisms of experts concerning matters of technique and interpretation. There has been no small interchange of techniques between the various disciplines represented in the Institute and there has been a growing and important group of coöperative enterprises. This is particularly obvious in the attitude of the graduate students and assistants, who have often spontaneously combined in the experimental study of normal and abnormal material."

February 6, 1936.

MARK A. MAY

Director Institute of Human Relations.